

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-30 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 15-30 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-30 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rose et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,709) in view of *Horstmann* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,401). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a content distribution system for performing content transaction management. The content distribution system comprises a plurality of user devices among which the content transaction management allows a content to be secondarily distributed, a secure container containing the content encrypted by a content key and container information including conditions set for a transaction of the content, a first section for distributing the content by transmitting said secure container, and a second section for performing person authentication. The second container performs person authentication when said secure container is transmitted among said plurality of user devices, based on a person identification certificate (hereinafter, simply referred to as an IDC) which includes a template having biometric information, encrypted in one of a plurality of manners, serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction and which is identified in reference to an IDC identifier list.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the person identification certificate (IDC) used for performing person authentication includes a template having biometric information. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Rose et al.* does not disclose transmitting the container of claim 1 using biometric

information. (May 29, 2007 Office Action, page 5.) *Rose et al.* is directed to distributing a trial use of a licensed application program. A user accepts the license by typing an identification name or a verification code. (col. 7, line 19-23.) Alternatively, the acceptance may be more passive, such that unless the user declines to accept the license terms, the license is accepted. (col. 7, lines 23-25.) Thus, in contrast to claim 1, *Rose et al.* does not disclose or suggest the use of a person identification certificate which includes a template having biometric information. Likewise, *Horstmann* is devoid of the use of a person identification certificate which includes a template having biometric information.

Since neither *Rose et al.* nor *Horstmann*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this limitation, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited art. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 and 6-14 depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4 and 6-14 are allowable over the cited art.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 29, 2007

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000